UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,351	09/13/2006	Kenji Sakamoto	1248-0827PUS1	2083

2292   7590   04/27/2010
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
DONADO, FRANK E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/27/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

ATTACHMENT

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 14, 15, 19 and 21

filed 4/5/10, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the

following reasons:

In response to Applicant's argument that the references fail to show

certain features of Applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which

applicant relies **(i.e., the connection request command not including a**

request for connection with a specific base station) are not recited in the

rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van*

Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). More specifically,

regarding Fingerhut not teaching Activation-Request Packet (ARP) not including

a request for connection with a specific base station, claim 1 states **"...requests**

a connection with a base device...", indicating said request does not include a

specific base station. It is not until the connection establishing means limitation

that claim 1 specifically mentions a specific base station.

Regarding Hunzinger not teaching a wireless terminal including a notifying

means for notifying, based on the first incoming set of identification data, a user

of the base device to which the wireless terminal is currently connected, the

mobile device clearly displays and identifies the received data in Paragraph 18,

lines 1-5. Regarding the mobile device not displaying or otherwise manifesting delivered content until the D-ACK is received, the mobile device still performs the notification after receiving the D-ACK, As indicated in Paragraph 18, lines 1-3.

Regarding Kim not teaching displaying identification data in an OSD manner, clearly a portable terminal displays video information in an OSD manner, as indicated in Column 1, lines 41-43 and 49-53 and Column 4, lines 20-32.

Regarding McDowall not teaching warning a user, based on a user's instruction that a connection confirmation command is not obtained from a base device, a selection is made by the user for the data. If the connection fails to be completed or fails after it is established, a server may cause verbal statements or other means to warn the user of the failed connection. The above features are described in Column 12, lines 11-25. In addition, said connection may be established via a cellular phone, as indicated in Column 4, lines 5-10 and 23-27, indicating the data that is selected may be delivered via a base station, as is understood in the art.

/Frank Donado/   /Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez/

Patent Examiner Art Unit 2617   Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617